



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/480,011 | 01/10/2000 | DEAN F. JERDING | A-5243 | 3800 |

5642 7590 10/20/2005

SCIENTIFIC-ATLANTA, INC.
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
5030 SUGARLOAF PARKWAY
LAWRENCEVILLE, GA 30044

EXAMINER

SHELEHEDA, JAMES R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2617

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/480,011

Applicant(s)

JERDING ET AL.

Examiner

James Sheleheda

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-11, 20, 21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews, III (Matthews) (5,874,985) (of record) in view of Hendricks et al. (Hendricks) (5,559,549) (of record).

As to claim 1, Matthews discloses a method for providing customizable multimedia messages over a television system to a communications terminal for presentation to a user (Fig. 1; column 1, lines 9-12), comprising:

creating at least one message configuration (wherein message formats were created and stored in memory, 68; column 5, lines 60-67);

sending the at least one message configuration to the communication terminal (column 5, lines 60-67), each message configuration having parameters for defining how the customizable multimedia message is presented to the user (column 6, lines 48-53);

receiving the at least one message configuration at the communication terminal (wherein the format information is received in some form to be stored in memory;

Art Unit: 2617

column 5, lines 60-67) at a first clock time (at a time before the messages are transmitted to the terminal; column 5, lines 44-67);

creating a first message activation request (column 5, lines 44-48 and column 6, lines 12-14) for presenting a first message content to the at least one message configuration (column 6, lines 14-21), wherein the first message activation request includes a message content expression (the message of text, audio or video; column 6, lines 14-25) and an identification of the at least one message configuration (message format indicator; column 6, lines 14-18); and

at a second clock time after the first clock time (wherein the format information was stored in memory before the message request was information; column 5, lines 44-67) sending the message request from the multimedia messaging server (column 6, lines 12-15 and column 7, lines 26-39) to the communications terminal over the television system (column 6, lines 30-37).

While Matthews discloses wherein the terminal receives a message configuration (message formats stored in memory, 68; column 5, lines 60-67), he fails to specifically disclose receiving the message configuration from the application server.

In an analogous art, Hendricks discloses a digital television distribution system (Fig. 1; column 2, lines 61-65) wherein a server (operations center, 202; Fig. 1) will generate and transmit message content (column 13, lines 36-55) and configuration information (column 10, lines 37-57 and column 13, lines 51-67) the configuration information having parameters for defining how the customizable information is presented to the user (column 10, lines 48-53 and column 13, lines 51-67) to a home

terminal (set top terminals; column 10, lines 37-57 and column 13, lines 51-67) which is stored in the home terminal (column 10, lines 37-57 and column 13, lines 51-67) for the typical benefit of allowing the format information to be updated and changed when desired (column 13, lines 64-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Matthew's system to include receiving the message configuration from the application server, as taught by Hendricks, for the typical benefit of allowing the format information to be updated and changed when desired.

As to claim 2, Matthews and Hendricks disclose wherein the message content expression comprises the first message content (the message of text, audio or video; see Matthews at column 6, lines 14-25).

As to claims 3 and 4, while Matthews and Hendricks disclose wherein the content expression comprises the content, they fail to specifically disclose a location reference to the first message content and delivering the content from a location reference.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of invention by applicant to transmit a location reference to identify a location from which to retrieve message content, such as utilized by the well known ATVEF standard, for the typical benefit of allowing the receiver to easily locate and display content from sources other than the broadcast provider.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Matthews and Hendricks system to include a location reference to the first message content and delivering the content from a location reference for the typical benefit of allowing the receiver to easily locate and display content from sources other than the broadcast provider.

As to claim 5, while Matthews and Hendricks disclose transmitting the configuration information during a first clock time, they fail to specifically disclose wherein the first clock time corresponds to a time during a boot-up procedure of the communications terminal.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of invention by applicant to transmit updated information to a receiver at boot-up or initialization for the typical benefits of ensuring that a recently activated system has the most current information.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Matthews and Hendricks system to include wherein the first clock time corresponds to a time during a boot-up procedure of the communications terminal for the typical benefit of allowing the receiver to easily locate and display content from sources other than the broadcast provider.

As to claim 6, Matthews and Hendricks disclose wherein the step of sending the first message activation request includes textual content as at least a portion of the message content expression (see Matthews at column 6, lines 21-25).

As to claims 7 and 8, Matthews and Hendricks disclose wherein the step of creating the message request includes creating audio content as at least a portion of the message content (see Matthews at column 6, lines 21-25).

As to claim 9, Matthews and Hendricks disclose wherein the step of sending the first message activation request includes sending message content consisting of a ticker tape (see Matthews at scrolling text; Fig. 4B; column 5, lines 30-35).

As to claim 10, Matthews and Hendricks disclose wherein responsive to receiving the first message activation request from the application server (see Matthews at column 6, lines 37-53), the communications terminal provides the first message content to a user according to the at least one message configuration (see Matthews at column 6, lines 37-53).

As to claim 11, Matthews and Hendricks disclose wherein the at least one message configuration corresponds to a default message configuration (see Hendricks at column 13, lines 58-61) and the identification of the at least one message configuration in the first message activation request is according to the absence of a

Art Unit: 2617

message configuration expression in the first message activation request (see Hendricks at column 13, lines 58-61).

As to claim 20, while Matthews discloses a system for providing customizable messages over a television system to a communications terminal for presentation to a user (Fig. 1; column 1, lines 9-12), comprising:

a multimedia messaging server (Fig. 1; service and application server 202a) that receives (based on decisions of an operator; column 2, lines 67-65, column 3, lines 1-5 and column 7, lines 35-39) at least one message configuration (column 6, lines 14-21) and associates message content (column 6, lines 21-25 and column 7, lines 35-39) for presentation to a user according to the at least one message configuration (column 6, lines 48-53) and generates a request according to the at least one message configuration (column 6, lines 30-37), the request including the message content and a message configuration expression (column 6, lines 12-18) for delivery over a television system to a communications terminal associated with the user (column 6, lines 30-37), wherein the multimedia messaging server is located in a headend (see Fig. 1); and

a multimedia messaging client (Fig. 1; controller 20) that receives the request (column 6, lines 44-47) and associates the message content and the message configuration for presentation of the message content according to the message configuration (column 6, lines 44-53), he fails to specifically disclose multiple application servers that generate at least one message configuration.

In an analogous art, Hendricks discloses a digital television distribution system (Fig. 1; column 2, lines 61-65) wherein a headend (Fig. 1, 208) will receive configuration information (column 10, lines 37-57 and column 13, lines 51-67) from multiple sources (column 8, lines 29-57) and transmit the information to a home terminal (set top terminals; column 10, lines 37-57 and column 13, lines 51-67) through a messaging server (signal processor, 209 processing the signals for transmission; column 8, line 58-column 9, line 22) for the typical benefit of allowing the multiple sources of information to transmit information to the user (column 8, lines 29-57 and column 13, lines 51-67).

Additionally, the examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of invention by applicant to utilize servers to receive and process incoming signals, such as in a cable headend, for the typical benefit of receiving and processing transmitted signals through well known and commonly utilized servers.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Matthew's system to include receiving the message configuration from the application server, as taught by Hendricks, for the typical benefit of allowing the multiple sources of information to transmit information to the user.

Additionally, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Matthew and Hendricks' system to include to utilize servers to receive and process incoming signals for the typical benefit of receiving and processing transmitted signals through well known and commonly utilized servers.

As to claim 21, Matthews and Hendricks disclose wherein the message configuration expression comprises a location reference (identifying the message format in memory the set top is to retrieve; see Matthews at column 5, lines 60-67 and column 6, lines 44-47) that is utilized by the multimedia messaging client in retrieving the message configuration for use in presenting the message content by the communications terminal (see Matthews at column 6, lines 44-46).

As to claim 24, Matthews and Hendricks disclose wherein the multimedia messaging client (see Matthews at Fig. 2; controller 20) includes a client application (graphics subsystem, 72) and a configuration manager (CPU, 66), wherein the configuration manager provides the client application (see Matthews at column 6, lines 44-46 and column 4, lines 48-52) with the message configuration associated with the message content (see Matthews at column 5, lines 60-67 and column 6, lines 1-5).

3. Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Hendricks and Freeman (6,020,980) (of record).

As to claim 25, while Matthews discloses a system for delivery of multimedia messages, comprising:

a multimedia messaging server (service and application servers, 202a) which generates a request (column 7, lines 35-39) that comprises message content (the message of text, audio or video; column 6, lines 14-25 and column 7, lines 35-39) and a message configuration expression (message format; column 6, lines 14-18), wherein

Art Unit: 2617

the multimedia messaging servers is located in a headend (see Fig. 1), he fails to specifically disclose multiple application servers that generate message content and a database of predefined message configurations and wherein the application server delivers the message content and at least one of the database of predefined message configurations to the multimedia messaging server.

In an analogous art, Hendricks discloses a digital television distribution system (Fig. 1; column 2, lines 61-65) wherein a headend (Fig. 1, 208) will receive content (column 13, lines 36-55) and configuration information (column 10, lines 37-57 and column 13, lines 51-67) from multiple sources (column 8, lines 29-57) and transmit the information to a home terminal (set top terminals; column 10, lines 37-57 and column 13, lines 51-67) through a messaging server (signal processor, 209 processing the signals for transmission; column 8, line 58-column 9, line 22) for the typical benefit of allowing the multiple sources of information to transmit information to the user (column 8, lines 29-57 and column 13, lines 51-67).

Additionally, the examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of invention by applicant to utilize servers to receive and process incoming signals, such as in a cable headend, for the typical benefit of receiving and processing transmitted signals through well known and commonly utilized servers.

Further, in an analogous art, Freeman discloses a communication system (Fig. 1) wherein a server (fax server, 122) will receive message content to be transmitted (column 8, lines 30-32) and contact a database (subscriber directory, 126) of predefined message configurations (column 8, 33-36 and lines 43-51) to determine the correct file

configuration for a particular subscriber (column 8, lines 7-14 and lines 30-36) for the typical benefit of choosing the correct message format in a system ensuring subscribers receive their messages in the format they desire (column 3, lines 23-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Matthew's system to include receiving the message configuration from the application server, as taught by Hendricks, for the typical benefit of allowing the multiple sources of information to transmit information to the user.

Additionally, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Matthew and Hendricks' system to include to utilize servers to receive and process incoming signals for the typical benefit of receiving and processing transmitted signals through well known and commonly utilized servers.

Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Matthew and Hendrick's system to include a database of predefined message configurations, as taught by Freeman, for the typical benefit of choosing the correct message format to ensure subscribers receive messages in their preferred format.

As to claim 26, Matthews, Hendricks and Freeman disclose wherein the message configuration expression comprises a location reference (identifying the message format in memory the set top is to retrieve; see Matthews at column 5, lines 60-67 and column 6, lines 44-47).

4. Claims 13-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Tanaka (US2003/0115600) (of record).

As to claim 13, Matthews discloses a method for receiving customizable multimedia messages over a television system at a communications terminal for presentation to a user (column 1, lines 9-12), comprising:

configuring at a multimedia messaging server (application servers, 202a controlling messaging in control node, 12; column 6, lines 12-25, column 5, lines 44-55 and column 7, lines 26-39) a plurality of different message requests (Figs. 4A and 4B; column 5, lines 10-22 and lines 36-43 and column 6, lines 48-53) with respective message content expression (Figs. 4A and 4B; column 6, lines 48-53 and lines 21-25) and respective message configuration expressions (Figs. 4A and 4B; column 6, lines 48-53 and lines 14-21);

configuring a first type of expression to correspond to including in a message request a location reference to retrieve message information (identifying the corresponding message format in memory the set top is to retrieve; column 5, lines 60-67 and column 6, lines 14-18 and lines 44-47);

configuring a second type of expression to correspond to including in a message request message information (containing the message of text, audio or video; column 6, lines 14-25);

receiving at a communication terminal (column 6, lines 12-15) from a multimedia messaging server (application servers, 202a controlling messaging in control node, 12;

Art Unit: 2617

column 6, lines 12-15 and column 7, lines 26-39) a first message request including a first message content expression (the message of text, audio or video; column 6, lines 14-25) and a first message configuration expression (message format indicator; column 6, lines 14-18);

responsive to receiving the first message request (column 6, lines 30-37), presenting a first message to a user (column 6, lines 48-53) according to the first message content expression (column 6, lines 48-53 and lines 21-25) and the first message configuration expression (column 6, lines 48-53 and lines 14-21);

receiving at the communications terminal (column 6, lines 12-15) from the multimedia messaging server (application servers, 202a controlling messaging in control node, 12; column 6, lines 12-15 and column 7, lines 26-39) a second message request (Figs. 4A and 4B; column 5, lines 10-22 and lines 36-43) including a second message content expression (the message of text, audio or video; Figs. 4A and 4B; column 6, lines 14-25) and a second message configuration expression (message format indicator; Figs. 4A and 4B; column 6, lines 14-18 and lines 10-22); and

responsive to receiving the second message request (Figs. 4A and 4B; column 6, lines 30-37), presenting a second message to a user (Figs. 4A and 4B; column 5, lines 10-22 and lines 36-43 and column 6, lines 48-53) according to the second message content expression (Figs. 4A and 4B; column 6, lines 48-53 and lines 21-25) and the second message configuration expression (Figs. 4A and 4B; column 6, lines 48-53 and lines 14-21), wherein the second message request includes at least one type of expression different than the type of expressions in the first message request

Art Unit: 2617

(indications of different format types to utilize; Figs. 4A and 4B; column 5, lines 10-35 and column 6, lines 14-21).

While Matthews discloses retrieving message information, he fails to specifically disclose retrieving message information from a location remote from a communication terminal.

In an analogous art, Tanaka discloses a television broadcast system (Fig. 1) wherein detailed information relating to a program or other data (paragraph 142, lines 1-8) is retrieved from a remote server based upon address information transmitted to the receiver (paragraph 9 and paragraph 10, lines 4-10), for the advantage of allowing the use of a receiver without an large storage means (paragraph 8 and paragraph 11).

Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Matthews' system to include retrieving the message configuration from a remote location, as taught by Tanaka, for the advantage of allowing the use of a receiver without an large storage means in the current message transmission system.

As to claim 14, Matthews discloses retrieving the message configuration utilizing the first message configuration expression, wherein the first message configuration expression corresponds to the first type of expression (identifying the message format in memory the set top is to retrieve; see Matthews at column 5, lines 60-67 and column 6, lines 44-47 and Tanaka at paragraph 9 and paragraph 10, lines 4-10).

As to claim 15, Matthews and Tanaka disclose wherein the step of presenting a first message includes presenting a message content according to the first message content expression (the message of text, audio or video; see Matthews at column 6, lines 14-25) and the first message configuration expression (message format indicator; see Matthews at column 6, lines 14-18), wherein the first message configuration expression corresponds to the second type of expression (message format indicator; see Matthews at column 6, lines 14-18).

As to claim 16, Matthews and Tanaka disclose wherein the second message configuration expression corresponds to the first type of expression (indicating the message format to be retrieved; see Matthews at column 6, lines 14-18 and Tanaka at paragraph 9 and paragraph 10, lines 4-10).

As to claim 17, while Matthews and Tanaka disclose wherein the content expression comprises message information, they fail to specifically disclose a location reference to retrieve message information.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of invention by applicant to transmit a location reference to identify a location from which to retrieve message content, such as utilized by the well known ATVEF standard, for the typical benefit of allowing the receiver to easily locate and display content from sources other than the broadcast provider.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Matthews and Tanaka's system to include a location reference to the first message content and delivering the content from the location reference for the typical benefit of allowing the receiver to easily locate and display content from sources other than the broadcast provider.

As to claim 18, Matthews and Tanaka disclose wherein the first message content expression corresponds to the second type of expression (the message of text, audio or video; see Matthews at column 6, lines 14-25).

As to claim 19, while Matthews and Tanaka disclose a content configuration expression in a message request, they fail to specifically disclose wherein an absence of a message configuration expression corresponds to a default message configuration.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of invention by applicant to utilize a default in the absence of a specific signal, whereby the system is to assume the default unless told otherwise, for the typical benefit of allowing the receiver to quickly process incoming messages by using the most common default setting in the absence of any other corresponding command.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Matthews and Tanaka's system to include wherein an absence of a message configuration expression corresponds to a default message configuration for the typical benefit of allowing the receiver to quickly process incoming

Art Unit: 2617

messages by using the most common default setting in the absence of any other corresponding command.

5. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews and Hendricks as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Jennings (5,781,186) (of record).

As to claim 22, while Matthews and Hendricks disclose a message configuration expression for use in presenting the message content by the communication terminal, he fails to specifically disclose wherein the message configuration expression comprises the message configuration.

In an analogous art, Jennings discloses a multimedia messaging system (Fig. 1; column 1, lines 7-8) wherein the presentation of messages is determined by presentation components contained within the message itself (column 1, lines 63-67 and column 2, lines 1-4) for the advantage of enabling a message to specify exactly how it should be presented without the need for any additional programming or equipment (column 2, lines 25-40).

Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Matthews and Hendricks system to include wherein the message configuration expression comprises the message configuration, as taught by Jennings, for the advantage of enabling a message to specify exactly how it should be presented without the need for any additional programming or equipment to be incorporated into the existing messaging system.

6. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews, Hendricks and Freeman as applied to claim 25 above, and further in view of Jennings.

As to claim 27, while Matthews, Hendricks and Freeman disclose a message configuration expression, they fail to specifically disclose wherein the message configuration expression comprises the message configuration.

In an analogous art, Jennings discloses a multimedia messaging system (Fig. 1; column 1, lines 7-8) wherein a created message contains components of both the message (column 1, lines 63-67) and presentation components (which determine how the message is displayed; column 2, lines 1-4) for the advantage of enabling a message to specify exactly how it should be presented without the need for any additional programming or equipment (column 2, lines 25-40).

Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Matthews, Hendricks and Freeman's system to include wherein the message configuration expression comprises the message configuration, as taught by Jennings, for the advantage of enabling a message to specify exactly how it should be presented without the need for any additional programming or equipment to be incorporated into the existing messaging system.

7. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews and Hendricks as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Freeman.

As to claim 23, while Matthews and Hendricks disclose the selection of a message configuration by the multimedia server, they fail to specifically disclose a database of message configurations accessible by the messaging server.

In an analogous art, Freeman discloses a communication system (Fig. 1) wherein a server (fax server, 122) will receive message content to be transmitted (column 8, lines 30-32) and contact a database (subscriber directory, 126) of predefined message configurations (column 8, 33-36 and lines 43-51) to determine the correct file configuration for a particular subscriber (column 8, lines 7-14 and lines 30-36) for the typical benefit of choosing the correct message format in a system ensuring subscribers receive their messages in the format they desire (column 3, lines 23-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Matthew and Hendricks' system to include a database of predefined message configurations accessible by the messaging server, as taught by Freeman, for the typical benefit of choosing the correct message format to ensure subscribers receive messages in their preferred format.

8. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews and Hendricks as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Davis et al. (Davis) (5,822,123).

As to claim 12, while Matthews and Hendricks disclose creating a second message activation request for presenting a second message content to the user according to the at least one message configuration (see Matthews at Figs. 4A and 4B;

Art Unit: 2617

column 5, lines 10-22 and lines 36-43 and column 6, lines 14-18 and lines 10-22), and presenting a second message content to the user according to the at least one message configuration (see Matthews at Figs. 4A and 4B; column 5, lines 10-22 and lines 36-43 and column 6, lines 48-53 and lines 14-21), they fail to specifically disclose creating a message at the communications terminal.

In an analogous art, Davis discloses a broadcast receiver (Fig. 1; column 8, lines 66-column 9, line 20) which will create a message to be displayed to the user (column 21, lines 24-34) when the user tunes to a channel they are not subscribed to (column 21, lines 24-34) for the typical benefit of allowing users to see and order additional channels and programming they are not currently subscribed to (column 21, lines 21-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Matthew and Hendricks' system to include creating a message at the communications terminal, as taught by Davis, for the typical benefit of allowing users to see and order additional channels and programming they are not currently subscribed to receive.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 13-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2617

10. Applicant's arguments filed 09/23/05, have been considered, but are not persuasive.

a. On pages 12 and 13 of applicant's response, applicant argues that Matthews fails to specifically disclose wherein an application server will create and send a message configuration.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

As indicated in the rejections above, the examiner has indicated that Matthews does not appear to disclose this feature. While Matthews has message formats stored in memory in the receiver and transmitting a message indicator to the receiver, he does not specifically state that the message formats are created and transmitted from the application server. Hendricks was in fact relied upon to teach this limitation.

b. On page 13, applicant argues that Hendricks does not disclose, teach or suggest providing customizable multimedia messages over a television system.

In response, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of

references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

i. As indicated in the rejections above, Matthews was relied upon to disclose the specific features of providing customizable multimedia messages over a television system. Hendricks was merely introduced to disclose transmitting format information over the television system from the head-end to the user's receiver.

ii. Hendricks specifically discloses transmitting customizable textual information to a user (column 13, line 27-column 14, line 6). This clearly meets the broad claim limitation of a "message".

c. In response to applicant's arguments on pages 14-15, see (b) and the rejections above.

d. On pages 16 and 17, applicant argues that Matthews fails to disclose a multimedia messaging server that receives at least one message configuration from multiple application servers and associates message content for presentation to a user according to at least one message configuration, ... wherein the multiple application server and multimedia server are located in the headend.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the

rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Applicant is directed to the rejections above wherein it is indicated that while Matthews discloses a multimedia messaging server (Fig. 1; service and application server 202a) that receives (based on decisions of an operator; column 2, lines 67-65, column 3, lines 1-5 and column 7, lines 35-39) a message configuration (column 6, lines 14-21), he was **not** relied upon to teach multiple application servers that generate at least one message configuration in the headend. As indicated in the rejections above, it was the Hendricks reference which was relied upon to disclose receiving multiple message configurations. Further, an Official Notice was included disclosing the widespread common use of servers in a headend to receive and process information transmitted across a network.

e. In response to applicant's arguments on pages 17-19, in regards to the combination of Hendricks with Matthews, see the rejections, (b) and (d) above.

f. On pages 19 and 20, applicant argues that Matthews fails to disclose each application server delivers the message content and at least one of the database of predefined message configurations to the multimedia message server, ...

wherein the multiple application servers and the multimedia messaging server are located in the headend.”

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Applicant is directed to the rejections above wherein it is indicated that while Matthews discloses a multimedia messaging server that receives content and a message configuration, he was **not** relied upon to teach multiple application servers that generate at least one message configuration in the headend and a database of predefined message configurations. As indicated in the rejections above, it was the Hendricks reference which was relied upon to disclose receiving multiple message configurations. Further, an Official Notice was included disclosing the widespread common use of servers in a headend to receive and process information transmitted across a network. Finally, it was the Freeman reference was relied upon to disclose the use of a database of predefined message configurations.

g. In response to applicant's arguments on pages 20-22, in regards to the combination of Hendricks with Matthews, see the rejections, (b) and (d) above.

h. On page 22, applicant argues that Freeman fails to disclose "each application server delivers the message content and at least one of the database of predefined message configurations to the multimedia messaging server, which in response thereto, generates a request that comprises the message content and a message configuration expression.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

As indicated in the rejections and (f) above, Freeman was only relied upon to disclose the use of a database of predefined message configurations. The application and messaging servers, and any functionality therein, are clearly indicated as being previously taught by the combination of Matthews and Hendricks in the rejections and (f) above.

i. In response to applicant's arguments on page 22 and 23, in regards to the combination of Matthews, Hendricks and Freeman, see the rejections and (f)-(h) above.

j. In response applicant's traversal of *all* of the Official Notices in the previous action, it is noted that the MPEP clearly states that to adequately

traverse a finding of Official Notice, an applicant must specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art... If applicant does not traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice or applicant's traverse is not adequate, the examiner should clearly indicate in the next Office action that the common knowledge or well-known in the art statement is taken to be admitted prior art because applicant either failed to traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice or that the traverse was inadequate."

See MPEP 2144.03

In this case, applicant has not specifically requested any evidentiary support with respect to references or specifically pointed out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. Applicant's general statement that none of the Official Notices include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support the conclusions does not point out any specific error or reason as to why any of the facts were not common knowledge or well-known in the art, and thus does not constitute a proper traversal. A blanket traversal to any and all Official Notices does not specifically point out any supposed errors.

Further, applicant's traversal is not persuasive. Applicant is directed to the rejections above where it is found that all of the previous Official Notices do in

fact include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical reasoning to support the conclusions.

The Official Notices taken that it was well known to transmit a location reference to identify a location from which to retrieve message content, utilize a default in the absence of a specific signal, whereby the system is to assume the default unless told otherwise and utilize servers to receive and process incoming signals, are hereby taken to be admitted prior art because applicant's traversals were in inadequate.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

12. The following are suggested formats for either a Certificate of Mailing or Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). The certification may be included with all correspondence concerning this application or proceeding to establish a date of mailing or transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). Proper use of this procedure will result in

Art Unit: 2617

such communication being considered as timely if the established date is within the required period for reply. The Certificate should be signed by the individual actually depositing or transmitting the correspondence or by an individual who, upon information and belief, expects the correspondence to be mailed or transmitted in the normal course of business by another no later than the date indicated.

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on _____
(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Signature: _____

Registration Number: _____

Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. () _____ - _____ on _____
(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Signature: _____

Registration Number: _____

Please refer to 37 CFR 1.6(d) and 1.8(a)(2) for filing limitations concerning facsimile transmissions and mailing, respectively.

Art Unit: 2617

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Sheleheda whose telephone number is (571) 272-7357. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James Sheleheda
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2617

JS



VIVEK SRIVASTAVA
PRIMARY EXAMINER